

### Summary of State Call 3-31-03

Participating: Rob Borowski (TX), Gary Johnson (LA), Sharon Baxter (VA), Mark McDermid/Jeff Smoller (WI), Jill Cooper/Phyllis Woodford (CO), David Bassage (WVa), Tom Franklin (NE), Gayla McCarty (IN), Bob Minicucci (NH), Al Innes (MN), Beth Graves (NC), Eileen McGovern (EPA).

Beth Graves (NC) indicated that she had offered to facilitate this first call and began with some background from the Denver meeting as to the initiation of the call. EPA sponsors state calls once per month to provide information on PTrack. As calls are limited to one hour, discussion is limited.

She suggested that some reasons for having a separate state call may be for information sharing among states and development of agenda ideas for the EPA/State PTrack calls. She asked for ideas from the group as to their thoughts on the need for calls and the role they might play. A summary follows:

Calls could be used for sub-committee updates. Currently, there are two sub-committees under PTrack with state participation - the PTrack Assistance Project (PTAP) to review trade association EMS templates led by Tim Stuart and the audit protocol and auditor qualification sub-committee led by Andy Teplitzky. There is also a state-initiated conference call regarding permits and contracts to develop EMS with states sponsoring voluntary EMS programs. The group recommended that these calls remain separate from PTrack as they do have content broader than just PTrack.

Calls may be used for states to vet issues where they may have differing positions. An example may be between "have" and "have-not" states in regards to resources.

Calls may also be used to collect information relative to consistency within regions. While the need for consistency is recognized, it was also stated that states often implement programs with variations in their own states to best fit local needs. These program options may also be of interest.

Calls may be used for EPA to funnel ideas to the states for initial feedback prior to formulating ideas.

The group discussed several broad themes. These included:

- Resources. Substantial discussion centered on this idea. Several states expressed that their pollution prevention efforts were being downsized and de-emphasized. Concern for finding staff and money to promote PTrack goes along with this. Core regulatory programs are being emphasized. What is EPA policy on pollution prevention and innovation with core programs?

Jill Cooper (CO) stated that they are exploring using SARA/TRI fee money to support pollution prevention grants and exploring using hope to expand use of funds to cover an FTE to support innovation programs. Jill Cooper (CO) stated that Strategic Goal #5 had OECA being responsible for pollution prevention and leadership programs. Suggested that they be pressed upon to support state efforts to help achieve this goal. Some indication that the region liked the concept but needed HQ support. Perhaps EPA PTrack HQ could offer assistance. There is an April 8 meeting of the Innovation Action Council that Mark McDermid is to attend. Suggestion that this may be a forum to ask for resource support of innovation strategy at state level.

Rob Borowski (TX) stated that we should explore integration with EPA and state agencies and look at how PTrack may operate locally. It may be that EPA runs PTrack in some states. It was suggested the strong need for resource support be presented to EPA and a response requested. Sharon Baxter (VA), Tom Franklin (NE), and Jill Cooper (CO) volunteered to develop

this concept via a workgroup.

- MOA. Gary Johnson (LA) asked how this process works. Does EPA initiate or the state? He asked what other states had signed these. Several comments on the MOA related back to resources and a desire to link the MOA to resource support. Gary also indicated some way to tie achievements back to a return for their efforts. Gary and Rob Borowski (TX) volunteered to flesh out this concept further.

- How can state agencies best address their own environmental performance? There was interest in more than information sharing. Several states expressed the need for data to show improvements in how the state agency operated. Was there a reduction in staff time spent or other ways in which the department burden were reduced? There was a strong sentiment that success stories are needed to convince top management to support such programs particularly when innovative program funding is being cut in favor of enforcement programs.

- What value do facilities see in PTrack? One state reported that they have had no new applications since the initial round. As the program complexity increases (new application requirements), how will value match?

- The concept was floated that if PTrack is a program that does not seem to continue its mission or maintain interest, that there should be a chance to say the program isn't working and consider substantial change or discontinuation. It may also be that the program will work in some states but not all states depending upon resources and other constraints.

The group was supportive of the calls continuing. The next call would be Mon. April 28 at 3pm EST (Eileen has already set up a conference call time as per her e-mail dated March 14).